

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended to improve form and provide improved correlation with the drawings and claims. Claims 40, 52, 54, and 56 have been amended, claims 55, and 57-59 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 40, 52, 54, 56, 60, and 61 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 40, 52, 54, 60, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nonomura et al. (U.S. Patent 5,915,067). The applicants respectfully traverse.

Nonomura does not disclose all the limitations of claim 40 as amended. For example, Nonomura does not disclose at least one title which is reproduced as a motion picture and has title identification information used for a title search, and title information, which corresponds to the at least one title, wherein the title information comprises title access type information indicating whether title reproducing by the title search to the corresponding title is permitted. The Examiner construes the PGC (program chain) and associated VOBs as corresponding to the title, and the level ID included in the PGC as corresponding to the title information. However, the PGC does not include title identification information used for a title search. The PGC is merely a list of a reproduction order of VOBs, and does not include any information used for title search. Although Nonomura does disclose a video title set having a title search pointer (col. 11, lines 3-5), Nonomura does not disclose that the level ID corresponds to the video title set. Rather, as shown in FIG. 5, the level ID corresponds to each PGC, not to the video title set. Accordingly, Nonomura does not disclose all the limitations of claim 40, and the rejection of claim 40 should be withdrawn.

Claim 52 recites limitations similar to claim 40. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 52 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 40.

Claims 54, 60, and 61 depend from claim 52. The rejection of claims 54, 60, and 61 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 52.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 55-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nonomura et al. (U.S. Patent 5,915,067) in view of Kanazawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,580,870). Claims 55 and 57 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; the rejection of these claims is thus moot, except to the extent that limitations from claims 55 and 57 have been incorporated into independent claims 50 and 42, as discussed above.

Claims 56 and 58 depend from claim 52. As discussed above with respect to claim 52, neither Nonomura nor Kanawaze disclose or suggest all the limitations of claim 52. Accordingly, neither Nonomura nor Kanazawa disclose all the limitations of dependent claims 56 and 58, and the rejection of claims 56 and 58 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION:

The Applicants request entry of this Rule 116 Response because the amendments should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised, and would thus not require further search and/or consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 7/7/08

By: 
Gregory L. Clinton
Registration No. 59,134

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510